The Regional Municipality of Peel

September 11, 1989

The Chairman and Members
of Regional Planning Committee

SUBJECT

Response to Submissions Received During Public Circulation of the draft Official Plan.

BACKGROUND

In response to directives from Regional Council, Planning staff undertook public circulation of the draft Official Plan. This consisted of a series of public information sessions, held at various locations throughout Peel, from February to May of this year. Planning staff also made presentations to interested parties on request during this period. Almost ten thousand copies of the "information tabloid" and over five hundred copies of the Plan were distributed.

On May 25, 1989 Regional Council passed the following Resolution:

> That Regional Council appoint Councillor D. Culham to chair the three public meetings on the Draft Official Plan;
>
> And further, that the Commissioner of Planning report back to Regional Council summarizing the outcome of the meetings including an outline of the submissions made;
>
> And further, that a public meeting be held, under Subsection 17(2) of the Planning Act, 1983, as part of the scheduled meeting of Regional Council on October 12, 1989;
>
> And further, that notification for this public meeting be undertaken in accordance with the Planning Act, 1983.

The three public meetings were held; one in each of the area municipalities, starting on May 30, 1989 in the City of Mississauga. The second was held in the Town of Caledon on June 6, 1989 with the third being held in the City of Brampton on June 13, 1989. The meetings, chaired by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of Regional Planning Committee, served as public forums to receive input from the public on the draft policies. Senior staff from the Planning and Public Works Departments and the Official Plan project's legal counsel were in attendance to explain the draft policies and answer questions.

A verbatim transcription service was contracted to record the proceedings of each meeting. An agenda for the May 30, 1989 meeting in Mississauga is attached as an example of how the proceedings were organized, (Item 1).

Each meeting was attended by representatives of ratepayers and special interest groups and individuals interested in making submissions and/or learning about the draft Plan. Members of Regional and the respective area municipal council were also in attendance. Submissions were made both verbally and in writing. Everyone attending each of the meetings was asked to fill out an address card and leave it with Planning staff. The names of attendees have been placed on the Policy Section's Plan circulation file which serves as the mailing list for notification of all future Plan related events. Notification of the submission of this report to Planning Committee will be carried out using this distribution list. There are over one thousand names of interested parties on the list.

Submissions made by all of the groups and individuals, either written or presented at any of the public meetings, have been summarized in this report. Comments by staff in response to each submission are also presented. These responses are not intended for Council adoption at this time, but rather for receipt and review, by Council and interested parties in preparation for the October 12, 1989 public meeting. Only after the area municipalities have responded should recommended revisions to the Plan be made by Council.

Upon submission to Regional Planning Committee, copies of this report will be sent to all those groups and individuals who submitted comments. Further, all interested parties on the draft Plan public circulation list will be notified by personal letter of the publication of the report. Copies will be available from the Planning Department.

The objective is to allow all those who made a submission and/or attended one of the public forums, to review the staff comments pertaining to their submission(s) prior to the public meeting on October 12, 1989. This report is also intended to help Regional Councillors prepare for the meeting by providing an outline of the issues raised by the public and Regional staff's comments in response to these issues.

The public meeting will be held during the regularly scheduled meeting of Regional Council on October 12. It will be open to the public so that anyone who wants to be heard on the matter of the draft Plan shall be given the opportunity to submit their comments and/or questions. Notice of the meeting has been published in a sufficient number of local newspapers to provide complete coverage of the Regional area as required under the Planning Act.

In addition to the public circulation process, Planning staff have been involved in discussions with staff from the area municipalities, Provincial

agencies and adjacent municipalities. Discussions with Provincial staff have been ongoing since late last year when the Plan was circulated to Provincial agencies. These discussions are now complete and comments have been received from all Provincial Ministries.

Specific concerns have been discussed with senior staff from all three area municipalities. Planning staff understand that the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton will submit reports, outlining their comments on the draft Plan, to their respective council this month. Staff from the Town of Caledon have indicated that they will wait until after the October 12 public meeting to make their report to Town Council.

It is imperative that comments from the area municipalities be received by no later than November 6 so that Planning staff can complete the review of submissions from all of the groups who commented on the Plan and compile a final set of proposed revisions for submission to Regional Council early next year.

DISCUSSION

Over the course of the public circulation process Planning staff received submissions from twelve groups or individuals pertaining to eleven Plan related issues concerning forty-eight specific parts of the Plan. This is summarized in Table 1, below.

Two written submissions were received from Pound Welch Associates Ltd., on behalf of their clients, Orlando Corporation, in late August. The summaries are included in Part A (Waste Management) and Part B (Definition/Designation of Urban Centres) of this report. Planning staff compiled a response to the submission pertaining to the Waste Management policies, but did not have sufficient time to prepare a response to the submission on the Urban Centres designations. Staff comments, on this submission will be prepared, though, and sent to all of the parties who made submissions and to Regional Councillors before the October 12, 1989 public meeting.

Most of the parties listed submitted comments on one or two policies in the Plan. Two groups, the Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee and the Mississauga Board of Trade, commented on twenty-one and ten different policies respectively.

The comments submitted and Regional staff comments have been organized by issue for the purposes of this report. The order of discussion will follow that outlined in Table 1.

TABLE 1

	ISSUE		GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE SUBMISSIONS
A.	Waste Management	A.	Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee Pound Welch Associates Ltd. (on behalf of Orlando Corp.)
B.	Definition/Designation of Urban Centres	B.	Brampton Downtown B.I.A. Pound Welch Assoc. Ltd. (on behalf of Orlando Corp.)
C.	Extension of Long-Term Urban Boundary	C.	Seaton Group Ltd. 648002 Ontario Ltd. R. E. Winter & Assoc. (on behalf landowners in West Brampton)
D.	Transportation	D.	Ratepayers along 20th Sideroad and 10th Line (Albion). Better By-pass for Bolton Group.
E.	Environment/Heritage	E.	Toronto Field Naturalists Mississauga Board of Trade
F.	Airport Noise	F.	G. Sanchioni
G.	Goals/Objectives	G.	Mississauga Board of Trade
H.	Affordable Housing	H.	Mississauga Board of Trade
I.	Regional Road Noise	I.	Mississauga Board of Trade
J.	Policy Implementation	J.	Mississauga Board of Trade
K.	Ancestral Burial Sites	K.	M. Harrison

A. WASTE MANAGEMENT

Two parties submitted concerns pertaining to the proposed waste management policies. The Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee submitted comprehensive comments on this part of the Plan. Pound Welch,on behalf of Orlando Corporation, devoted the second of a two-part submission to an issue related to these policies.

General Concerns (Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee)

The Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee submit that they are opposed to landfilling as the sole solution to waste management and urge that future plans implement state-of-the-art technologies. The group also submit that the respective area municipal official plan should conform to the Waste Management Master Plan once it is adopted.

Staff Comments

Subsection 4.4.3 of the draft Plan states that the Waste Management Master Plan shall "...identify programs and facilities to achieve the maximum possible reductions in the amount of waste requiring disposal through reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery in cooperation with the respective area municipality." This is a clear indication that the Region agrees with the group's submission that landfilling is not the sole solution to the management of municipal waste.

With respect to the submission that the area municipal plans should conform to the Waste Management Master Plan, it is possible to include this requirement in the Regional Official Plan. However, because the Regional Official Plan and the Master Plan are written in accord and because the Planning Act requires area municipal plans to conform with the Regional plan, it is suggested that the extra step is not necessary.

Specific Concerns (Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee)

1) The group submit that the word "may" should be replaced with "shall" in the following policies:

   *4.4.2.1 - "The Regional Municipality of Peel Act states that the Region is responsible for providing facilities for the purpose of receiving, dumping and disposing of waste and that no area municipality shall provide such facilities. Further, the Region may engage in reducing, recovering, recycling and reusing waste and collecting, receiving, handling, treating, processing, buying, selling or exchanging recyclable material".

Staff Comment

The use of the term "may" in this policy allows Regional Council to determine what should be implemented as part of the Region's commitment to waste reduction and recovery. This commitment is stated in Subsection 4.4.3. (paragraph 4.4.3.5.) which states "Council shall adopt a comprehensive Waste Management Master Plan to guide the future of waste in Peel Region which shall... identify programs and facilities to achieve the maximum possible reductions in the amount of waste requiring disposal through reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery in cooperation with the respective area municipality."

*4.4.2.2. - "Area Municipalities may by by-law provide for the collection and delivery of wastes to disposal sites and/or recycled materials to recovery facilities in accordance with the Regional Municipality of Peel Act;"

Staff Comment

Section 210(83) of the Municipal Act reads "By-laws may be passed by the councils of local municipalities...(83)...for establishing and maintaining a system for the collection removal and disposal of garbage..."

When the Regional Municipality of Peel Act was legislated, Section 132(2) removed the ability of the local municipalities within Peel, to operate waste disposal facilities but left them the option under 210(83) to operate "collection systems".

*4.4.6.2 - "Council may designate Areas of Influence around Sanitary Landfill Site(s) or Waste Processing Plant(s) by amendment to Schedule A of this Plan;"

Staff Comment

Staff agree with this wording change.

*4.4.6.9 - "Council may pass by-laws to prescribe one or more haul routes on specified Regional roads to be used by vehicles hauling waste and/or recyclable materials to (or from) any Landfill Site or Waste Processing Plant located in Peel Region;" and,

Staff Comment

Staff agree with this wording change.

•4.4.6.10 - "A respective area municipality may, by by-law, prescribe one or more haul routes on specified local roads to be used by vehicles hauling waste and/or recyclable materials to (or from) a Landfill Site or Waste Processing Plan subject to the approval of Regional Council."

Staff Comment

Staff agree with this wording change.

2) Amendments to the Waste Management Master Plan should only come by amendment to the Regional Official Plan and the respective area municipal plan. Also should the Master Plan be adopted before the Official Plan?

Staff Comments

To answer this submission, it is first necessary to explain the relationship between the Regional Official Plan and the Waste Management Master Plan. The Master Plan is a lengthy and detailed document dealing with the many policy issues which addresses waste management issues only. The draft Plan, on the other hand, is an overall policy document and does not, therefore, contain detailed program policies. On this basis, it is appropriate that the draft Regional Official Plan only provide the broad policy framework on waste management issues with the details being included in the Waste Management Master Plan.

However, there is no reason why the draft Regional Official Plan should not contain a statement that the Master Plan has to conform to it. On the other hand it is not necessary to require the Master Plan to conform to the area municipal official plans because they are already required to conform to the Regional Official Plan.

3) The phrase ". . . and commit to implement and continuously upgrade such plan" should be added to paragraph 4.4.3.1

Staff Comments

The section already states "... which takes into consideration the advent of new technologies/alternatives and..." on this basis a change does not appear necessary.

Also, with the adoption of the Master Plan within the context of a Provincially approved Official Plan the review and update of both documents

will be undertaken at least every five years as required under the Planning Act.

4) Paragraph 4.4.3.11 has to be clarified in light of participation in the Greater Toronto Area Waste Management studies.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.3.11 states that the Region will allow wastes for which it is responsible which are generated in Peel, to be managed in Peel. All of Section 4.4. is currently under review in light of future decisions regarding the Region's involvement in the Greater Toronto Area Waste Management Studies.

5) With respect to the definition for "Sanitary Landfill Site", in paragraph 4.4.4.1:

a) what is land farming?

b) does the phrase "not limited to" leave room for state of the art incineration?

Staff Comments

a) The term "landfarming" refers to a process where soils contaminated with organic materials such as gasoline, are spread onto the ground to promote natural decomposition and the eventual reclamation of the soils.

b) State of the art incineration is included in the definition of "Waste Processing Plants' in paragraph 4.4.5.1.

6) The requirement for an Environmental Assessment should be included in paragraph 4.4.4.2 this policy reads "the establishment of a new sanitary landfill site or the expansion of an existing site shall require an amendment to this Plan.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.4.2 should be revised to include the phrase ". . . and shall have regard for all relevant Provincial Legislation" to follow ". . . shall require an amendment to this Plan and the respective area municipal plan . . ."

7) Paragraph 4.4.4.4 which reads "Council shall consider the potential of lands for sanitary landfill use when reviewing applications to develop those lands by amendment to this Plan and the respective area municipal plan "should be clarified".

Staff Comments

The intent of paragraph 4.4.4.4 is to have regard for potential sanitary landfill sites when reviewing development applications. This would cover situations where development applications are made on or adjacent to lands being studied for landfill.

8) Provision should be made for the monitoring of non-Regional personnel in paragraph 4.4.4.5, this policy reads "All new Sanitary Landfill Sites within Peel Region shall be owned by the Region but may be operated under agreement by non-Regional personnel."

Staff Comments

All contracted operations are governed by conditions which are outlined in Certificates of Approval. The Region is, therefore, responsible for the operation inspection and monitoring, if required. The terms for a Certificate of Approval for an operation such as a landfill would be developed subject to the requirements under the Environmental Assessment Act and the Environmental Protection Act.

9) In reference to paragraph 4.4.4.7; after uses for abandoned landfills should be continuously updated. Also, what after uses would conform to the Regional Plan?

Staff Comments

Land uses which conform to the Regional Plan can be determined by referring to Part 5 of the document. The designations are general, though, and make reference to the more detailed area municipal land use designations. The respective area municipal official plan, secondary plans and zoning bylaws as well as requirements under the Environmental Protection Act will be used to determine after use compatibility. Paragraph 4.4.4.7 could, therefore be revised to read "...uses which conform to this Plan, the respective area municipal plan and the Environmental Protection Act.."

10) Paragraph 4.4.4.8 reads "Council shall ensure long-term safety by establishing gas and leachate monitoring programs when necessary prior to, during and following the operation of all Sanitary Landfill

Sites". This policy should refer to "monitoring and treatment programs" and the words "when necessary" should be deleted.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.4.8. should be revised to read ". . . gas and leachate monitoring programs and treatment facilities, if these facilities are considered to be necessary on the basis of the monitoring programs prior to, during and following the operation of all Sanitary Landfill Sites."

11) Paragraph 4.4.4.9. reads "...new Sanitary Landfill Sites should be selected on the basis of each area municipality providing a share of the total land required for the sites subject to the economic, transportation, land use and environmental impacts..." the group submit that the policy should be revised to read "each area municipality, in rotation, providing a share."

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.4.9. reflects a Council supported position which relates to the area municipalities sharing the responsibility for land requirements for new sites subject to all required environmental, economic, etc. studies.

12) A policy should be added to Subsection 4.4.4 which deals with "vermin control."

Staff Comments

Operations policies such as "vermin control" are addressed in the design documents generated from the environment assessments required under the Environmental Assessment Act and the Environmental Protection Act. These more detailed policies, therefore, should not be included in the draft Plan, which should contain broad policies only. If detailed operational policies begin to be included in the Plan, the eventual list could be quite long and detailed.

13) In reference to the phrase "which is of sufficient size to require an environmental assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act . . ." in paragraph 4.4.5.1; what constitutes "sufficient size"?

Staff Comments

The "sufficient size" referred to in paragraph 4.4.5.1 is defined in Regulation 205-87 to the Environmental Assessment Act. Section 5(2) of the

Regulations states that operations requiring an investment of less than 3.5 million dollars are exempt from the requirements of the Act.

14) In reference to paragraph 4.4.5.2; the establishment of a new "waste processing plant" should require an environmental assessment in addition to an amendment to the Plan.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.5.2. should be revised to include the phrase "...and shall have regard for all relevant Provincial legislation" to follow "...shall require an amendment to this Plan and the respective area municipal plan..."

15) Paragraph 4.4.5.3 reads "the establishment and operation of Waste Processing Plants shall be subject to the policies in the Plan, all relevant Provincial Legislation and shall consider the policies in the respective area municipal plan". The policy should specify that, for incineration and/or other thermal reduction processes, there must be extensive and constant monitoring and control of burn temperatures particularly during start up and shut down periods as well as monitoring of emissions.

Staff Comments

The response to this comment is the same as that for Comment 12. Further, these detailed operations' policies will be articulated in the Master Plan within the context of paragraph 4.4.6.7 of the Official Plan.

16) In reference to paragraph 4.4.6.3; the phrase "different dimension" should be replaced with "greater dimension." Further, where "heavily built-up residential areas" or "environmentally sensitive areas" are involved, the dimension should be "considerably larger." The group suggests a minimum of 1000 meters.

Staff Comments

The 500 meter distance referred to in paragraph 4.4.6.3 has been established by the Ministry of the Environment as a guideline between a working face in a landfill operation and residential uses. This distance has been referred to as the "Area of Influence" in Subsection 4.4.6.

Note: reference to the "Area of Environmental Influence" referred to in paragraph 4.4.6.11 (Subsection 4.4.6) will be revised to read "Area of Influence."

The "Area of Influence" includes a buffer zone which, in the case of the Britannia landfill site is 60 meters from the perimeter of the site. This area is established to contain gas and leachate monitoring systems, tree screens, berms, etc. The Area of Influence extends beyond the perimeter of the site to, as previously stated, a guideline distance of 500 meters from the closest working face.

The "outside edge" of the Area of Influence will, therefore, move as the working face within the site moves. The draft policies state that the Area of Influence shall be established for all sites on the basis of the factors listed in paragraph 4.4.6.1. These factors conform with requirements under the Environmental Assessment and the Environmental Protection Acts.

The size of the Area of Influence or the distance from which it will extend from a working face will vary on the basis of the site-specific environmental analyses conducted for each site. A buffer zone will always be incorporated into an area of influence as a strip of land internal to a site, to be used for the installation of monitoring systems, screening and berming. The text therefore, should not be charged as it still provides flexibility.

17) What constraints apply to the land use control powers under the Regional Municipality of Peel Act referred to in paragraph 4.4.6.4?

Staff Comments

Paragraph 4.4.6.4 makes reference to one of the revisions to the Regional Municipality of Peel Act proposed by Regional staff. The policies in Section 4.4 "Waste Management" were drafted in light of these proposed revisions. The entire Section is currently under review by Regional staff in light of the status of these proposals. Changes will have to be made if it becomes apparent that the revisions to the Peel Act will not be adopted and submitted to the Province for approval within the adoption time frame (early 1990) of the Official Plan.

18) Public participation should be specified in paragraph 4.4.6.5

Staff Comments

Staff recommend that if the proposed revisions to the Region of Peel Act are not adopted within the Plan adoption time frame paragraph 4.4.6.5 should be revised to read "The identification of Study Areas for the purposes of locating or expanding sanitary landfill sites and waste processing plants shall be undertaken in accordance with all relevant Provincial Legislation." This will articulate Council's existing obligation to follow the site selection process in

accordance with the Environmental Assessment Act, the Environmental Protection Act and the Planning Act including requirements for public notification.

19) Monitoring of waste, as specified in paragraph 4.4.6.12, should be mandatory. Further, monitoring should be undertaken and where waste is generated (at source), should be completed at least once a month. The results should be made available to "anyone."

Staff Comments

It is most effective to monitor the entry of wastes to Regional facilities, in light of the jurisdictional and logistical problems inherent in Regional staff monitoring at source. Programs are currently underway to accomplish this and are being expanded. Monitoring of waste at source is effective only when a known "toxic" can be traced. Permission to enter a property may then be obtained to allow Regional staff to carry out the required testing.

The specifics of how monitoring programs will be carried out should be articulated in operations' policies, which are developed on the basis of Official Plan Policy (paragraph 4.4.6.12).

20) The phrase "unless approved by Council" should be removed from paragraph 4.4.6.13. which reads "Waste originating from a municipality or jurisdiction outside of Peel Region shall not be disposed of at any Sanitary Landfill Site or Waste Plant operated by or for the Region unless approved by Council.

Staff Comments

The phrase ". . . unless approved by Council" should not be removed from paragraph 4.4.6.13. This phrase gives Council the required flexibility to enter into inter-Regional waste management programs such as those currently under discussion between the Regions within the Greater Toronto Area and the Province. The development of a closed door policy by the Region may not be to the Region's advantage.

Concerns (Pound Welch Associates Ltd.)

Pound Welch Associates Ltd. are planning consultants for Orlando Corporation (Cantay Holdings Inc.) owners of the "Heartland" industrial and commercial "business community" in the City of Mississauga. Their concern relates to the policies in Section 4.4 which deal with the "Area of Influence" designation around the Britannia Landfill Site adjacent to their client's property.

They submit that based on the assumption that the Britannia site was located and designed to contain landfill and mitigate any potential for off-site migration of by-products, the 500 metre "area of influence" surrounding the site may result in undue restrictions to adjacent development particularly after the site has been closed.

The group refers to the Ministry of the Environment guidelines which require minimum separation distances of 20 metres for gas and 30 metres for leachate. They also point out that the Britannia site incorporates a 60 metre buffer within its perimeter which substantially exceeds these Provincial minimum distance requirements.

The submission requests that an appropriate official plan policy be included which provides for the elimination of the 500 metre "areas of influence" from around sanitary landfill sites which have been officially closed. The submission also states that the Master Plan "should promote rehabilitation land use options and provide rationale as to how the landfill site will compliment planned community design once its service life is expired . . ."

Staff Comments

The group is quite right in stating that the policies in Subsection 4.4.6 refer to operating landfill sites. As outlined in the staff response to the comment by the Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee's "Concern 16", the Areas of Influence, based on the Ministry of the Environment's 500 meter distance extend out "from the closest working face" unless the factors outlined in paragraph 4.4.6.1 as applied to a specific site, conclude that a different dimension be used.

These proposed policies reflect the existing implementation of the 500 meter "Area of Influence" around the Britannia landfill site. Since the "closest working face" moves through the lifespan of the site, so will the limits established by the Area of Influence. It must be understood that this area includes the buffer zone established within the site, separating the site's working area from its perimeter.

Paragraph 4.4.4.7 states that sanitary landfill sites which have been completed (or are no longer operational) shall be rehabilitated to uses which conform to this Plan (and the respective area municipal plan) and the Environmental Protection Act. After uses may be "restricted" only if they are proposed for lands within an Area of Influence. This area(s) will exist after the operational lifespan of a site has expired only if site-specific analyses, based on on-site monitoring systems established during operation, require it.

B. THE DEFINITION AND DESIGNATION OF URBAN CENTRES

Concerns (Downtown Business Improvement Area)

The Downtown Business Improvement Area strongly opposes the designation of the Brampton "Four Corners" and Bramalea City Centre as "Secondary Urban Centres" on Schedule A of the Plan. The group is concerned that the "Secondary" designation will make it more difficult for the City to compete for commercial investment or government funding of, for example, new transportation initiatives. They are particularly concerned in light of the "Primary Urban Centre" designation given to Mississauga's city centre, Square One.

Staff Comments

A representative from the organization presented this group's concerns at the June 13 public forum in Brampton. At that time the Regional Planning Commissioner stated that the draft Plan reflects what is currently in the respective Provincially approved area municipal official plan. The City of Brampton currently designates a "Commercial Corridor" which extends from south of Shopper's World to the Brampton Four Corners then west to the Bramalea City Centre. The City's commercial "core" therefore consists of a series of nodes with connecting links. The ultimate size and function of each node differs as defined in the City's Official Plan and respective secondary plan. It was on the basis of these area municipal policies that Regional staff developed the dual "Secondary Urban Centre" designations for Brampton in the draft Regional Plan.

Mississauga's city centre, Square One, was also defined in the draft Plan on the basis of the existing area municipal Official Plan and secondary plan policy. When the ultimate size of the two municipality's "city centres" is examined, it becomes apparent that a hierarchy exists. The ultimate planned gross leasable area (GLA), for retail commercial uses, based on the official plans and secondary plans of the respective area municipalities, for Brampton's Commercial Corridor is about 256,000 square meters while that for Mississauga's Square One is about 332,750 square meters. The GLA for service/office space in the Brampton Corridor is about 248,000 square meters while this component in Square One is about 2.3 million square meters.

When the ultimate size and function of these two "urban areas" is examined at a regional scale it becomes apparent that Square One does provide a more prominent regional commercial/service function than Brampton's commercial nodes.

Regional staff recognize that the City of Brampton has initiated a strategic planning exercise which will review the existing policy regarding the Commercial Corridor. Regional Planning staff have discussed this with senior staff from the City of Brampton and recognize that the proposed "urban centres" policies shall be reviewed on the basis of further discussions with the City.

Concern (Pound Welch Associates Ltd.)

A submission related to the urban areas' designations was also made by the consulting firm of Pound Welch Assoc. Ltd. on behalf of Orlando Corporation (Cantay Holdings Inc.). The firm requests that the draft Plan be modified to designate their client's lands as "Secondary Urban Centre." The subject lands are referred to as the "Heartland" Business Community, located at Highway Nos. 401 and 10 in the City of Mississauga. The lands comprise over 90% of the Britannia West Business Park Secondary Plan Area.

The submission states that Orlando's "Heartland" development represents a concentration of commercial, industrial, service and residential land uses large enough to conform to the Plan's definition of "Secondary Urban Centre." Specifically, the group is asking that Schedule A be revised to include another "Secondary Urban Centre" at the north-east corner of Britannia and McLaughlin Roads, in the City of Mississauga, and that Figure 1 be modified so that a "City/Regional Centre" be identified at the same location.

Staff Comments

As previously indicated staff did not have sufficient time to prepare comments to this submission for inclusion in this report. Staff comments will be prepared and sent to all of the parties who made submissions and to Regional Council before the October 12th public meeting.

C. EXTENSION OF THE LONG-TERM URBAN BOUNDARY

Three submissions were received which relate to the extension of "urban" development into the "Rural Lands" designation on Schedule A of the Plan. The submissions were made by Seaton Development Ltd., 648002 Ontario Ltd. and R. E. Winter and Associates Ltd.

Concern (Seaton Development Ltd.)

The submission from Seaton Development Ltd. proposes the localized installation of pre-fabricated sewage treatment systems, constructed to municipal standards, to service higher density residential development and existing settlements in rural Peel. The submission cites the technical advantages of this type of system over septic systems and states that higher density residential development in rural Peel would be more cost-effective, with respect to the provision of municipal services, and would accommodate proposals for the development of affordable housing more readily than low density estate residential development. These systems would be privately operated which would require the Region to perform a supervisory function only.

Staff Comments

In response, it is important to note that the draft Plan is based on the Provincially approved policies contained in the area municipal official plans. These policies are based on the assumption that fully serviced urban development proceed in an orderly, planned fashion. The Region has supported this approach in establishing its five-year capital works projections. Further, the South Peel Servicing Agreement was established on the assumption that development in urban lands will be serviced by public sewers, and that development in rural lands will be serviced by individual septic systems subject to approval by the Regional Health Department.

The submission envisages the establishment of "nodes" of development within rural Peel, with self-contained sewage services. This contradicts the long-established basis for the provision of fully serviced urban development in Peel.

The City of Brampton has initiated a strategic planning process which will, in part, provide the basis of the review of the existing (approved) long-term urban boundary. The Town of Caledon has initiated a review of its official plan which includes an assessment of the Town's place within the Greater Toronto Area and the impact this has on future directions for fully serviced (urban) development within that municipality.

Staff are of the opinion that proposals, such as the one submitted by the Seaton Group, wait for the outcome of these two fundamental policy reviews in that they may result in changes in the long-term land use policies of the respective area municipality and the Region.

Concern (R. E. Winter and Associates)

The submission by R. E. Winter and Associates is made on behalf of a number of landowners in the 2500 acres generally bounded by Mayfield Road

in the north, McLaughlin Road in the east, the CNR rail line in the south and Creditview Road in the west. The submission requests that these lands be included within the "Long Term Urban Boundary" and therefore, be designated "Urban Lands" on Schedule A. The submission cites the need for proactive planning, to avoid problems in dealing with future development applications in the area, the rapid rate of growth in the City, the proximity of the area to servicing, and the recent release of the "Land Use Planning For Housing" policy statement as supporting rationale.

Staff Comments

The comments in response to this submission are the same as those outlined for the submission by Seaton Development Ltd.

Concern (648002 Ontario Ltd.)

The submission by 648002 Ontario Ltd. makes reference to the "Potential Mineral Resource Area" designation on Schedule 1. Specifically, the Company is concerned about how the designation in the western part of the City of Brampton will affect their lands located in the southeast corner of Concession 3, Part Lot 11.

The Company strongly objects to the designation because they feel that it will restrict their ability to develop the lands to "their highest and best use." The submission sites an apparent contradiction between the Plan's objectives related to the development of a strong and diverse economic base and the subject designation on Schedule 1.

Staff Comments

In response to the submission by 648002 Ontario Ltd. it should be noted that the area in west Brampton is designated "Potential Mineral Resource Area" to delineate one of the few remaining areas in south central Ontario where shale resources (used in brick manufacture) occur within 7.6 meters of the ground surface. This means that they are readily accessible to quarrying operations where this type of land use is practical on the basis of site-specific studies. It is recognized that only limited "sites" within the designated area may still be "available" for future extraction and processing operations. This may only be determined on the basis of the site-specific analysis of the area in light of existing (and proposed) long-term land use policies and the status of the surrounding lands.

The designations on Schedule 1 and the accompanying policy, as articulated in paragraph 3.3.2.1 of the draft Plan, provides direction to the area municipalities in the establishment of planning policies within the designated areas.

Staff submit that this does not represent a contradiction to the Plan's objective of encouraging the development of a strong and healthy economic base, but supports the Plan's goal of promoting the sound management and use of Peel's natural resources.

D. TRANSPORTATION

Three groups submitted concerns related to this issue.

Concern - (20th Sideroad Group)

A large group of residents who live along 10th Line and 20th Sideroad, east of Highway 50, in the Town of Caledon (former Albion Township) are concerned with the designation of these two roads as "Major Arterials" on Schedule 2 of the Plan. Opposition to the proposed designations is based on a perceived lack of technical rationale for their establishment, the topography of the area in question, the incompatibility of surrounding residential land uses and the impact of a major arterial on existing roads. The residents also submit that if the subject roads are not designated "Major Arterial," consideration be given to the restriction of truck traffic on 20th Sideroad east of Highway 50.

Staff Comments

Discussions between Regional staff and the Mayor of the Town of Caledon, E. Kolb, and Councillor Currie resulted in a decision that the "Major Arterial" designation for the roads in question should be removed from Schedule 2. This was outlined in letters to Mr. Penfold (who made a specific request for a written response at the June 6 public meeting in Caledon and has been since supported by a resolution of the Town of Caledon. The status of these roads in the long term, including whether restrictions to truck traffic are warranted, will be established on the basis of the transportation studies currently underway as part of the Town's Official Plan review.

Concern - (Bolton By-Pass Group)

The second submission also relates to the designation of "Major Arterials" on Schedule 2 and was made by The Better Bypass For Bolton Group. The submission articulates the group's opposition to the designation of a major arterial road by-passing Bolton to the east. The group submits that the designation of this route is premature in light of the recent OMB decision that found it inappropriate to designate the unopened portion of Townline, east of Bolton, in the absence of an evaluation of alternative routes and a clear decision on which route should be chosen. The group also submits that a request has been made for the Ministry of the Environment to bump up the

subject route to full Environmental Assessment status. The request for the bump-up has since been granted by the Minister of the Environment.

The group submits that the Region must address the following concerns before the eastern route can be designated:

* environmental impact studies must be completed for the entire route;

* regrading and construction costs, for bridges, etc., must be determined;

* the availability of Provincial funding; and,

* the transportation needs of the industrial area to the west of Bolton.

Staff Comments

As stated previously, the Town of Caledon is currently reviewing its Official Plan. A key component of this review is the analysis of traffic demands within the Town. An important part of this analysis is the identification of a north-south arterial (or bypass) around the Settlement of Bolton.

Regional staff are working closely with Town staff in the completion of a transportation study, the results of which will form the basis for any necessary amendments to designations in both Caledon's and the Region's official plans.

Determination of preferred alignments and actual construction of new arterials will be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act and/or the Environmental Protection Act.

Concern (Mississauga Board of Trade)

The third submission related to transportation issues is made by the Mississauga Board of Trade. This group submits that Section 1.1c should outline the development of a "Transportation Advisory Group" to advise local business groups of Regional transportation policy.

Staff Comments

In response to this submission, staff note that Regional Councillors and staff have always been available to the general public and special interest groups to discuss issues and they will continue to be available. For example, Regional Transportation Policy staff have discussed transportation issues with both the Brampton and the Mississauga Boards of Trade.

Staff are not opposed to the establishment of such a "group" but note that the Regional Official Plan does not have to be amended to permit its formation.

E. PRESERVATION OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE FEATURES

Two groups made submissions related to this issue.

Concern (Toronto Field Naturalists)

The Toronto Field Naturalists submit that an inventory of natural features in Peel should be completed. When this is done ways should be found to link heritage features with natural corridors. The group is also concerned that new ways be found to deal with stormwater runoff so that it will no longer be directed only to watercourses.

Staff Comments

In response to the submission by the Toronto Field Naturalists it should be noted that an inventory of natural features does exist including reports, maps and automated data systems. The Planning Department employs a geologist who provides, among other things, a consulting service to the area municipalities, the development industry and the general public.

A variety of recent initiatives are under way which will, when completed, identify features of natural and historic (and archaeological) interest and link them with trail (pathway) systems. These projects include:

- development of a Heritage Trail along the Credit River Valley;
- coordination of Archaeological Master Plans;
- development of a plan for the Mississauga Waterfront; and,
- MTRCA's Greenspace Strategy.

In response to the group's second concern, it should be noted that stormwater drainage is predominantly an area municipal responsibility. An initiative is underway which is examining the impact of storm drainage (among other things) on the water quality of drainage systems within municipalities in the Toronto area. The Metropolitan Toronto Remedial Action Plan development initiative, coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment, has brought representatives from municipalities, the Province, the private sector and the general public together to develop a plan which will begin to address sources of the water quality problems in Toronto-area watersheds.

Concern (Mississauga Board of Trade)

The Mississauga Board Of Trade is concerned about proposed Regional involvement in "historic matters". The group considers this a local responsibility. The Board recommends that the Plan recognize this delineation of responsibility and that it outline the Region's role in heritage preservation more clearly.

Staff Comments

In response, it must be pointed out that heritage, like the environment, is a responsibility of all levels of government. Establishment of landfill sites and Regional Roads are two areas of traditional Regional responsibility which require a sensitivity towards heritage issues. This is what the Official Plan is attempting to document. The Region has no intention of interfering in those areas of heritage that are clearly defined under the Ontario Heritage Act as being the responsibility of local municipalities. (LACAC's, heritage designation, municipal heritage building grants, etc.) Submission of draft plans of subdivision to Ministry of Culture and Communications for archaeological comment is an ex :nple of where the Region has adhered to the spirit of the heritage component of the Official Plan, without transgressing into areas of local municipal responsibility.

The Region has operated the Region of Peel Archives since 1977, which serves as the official archival repository for all four municipal governments, as well as both Boards of Education. As well as providing an invaluable heritage function, the existence of a Regional Archives has benefitted from economies-of-scale and the avoidance of useless duplication of service. In addition, the Regional Archives serves as a valuable resource for local LACAC's and historical groups throughout the Region. The Streetsville Historical Society, in fact, recently argued strongly against the establishment of a Mississauga facility because of the factors listed above.

The Region has operated the Region of Peel Museum since 1984. The Museum was founded in 1968, and was operated as a County Museum and Art Gallery by the Peel Historical Society until the Region took responsibility for it. The Museum does not compete with Mississauga's Bradley House, but rather provides a context for viewing the House in a larger perspective. The Museum is part of the Peel Heritage Complex, which also includes the Archives and the Region of Peel Art Gallery. The Complex provides outstanding nationally-recognized heritage education programming to both school systems as well as the general public.

F. AIRPORT NOISE

Concerns (G. Sanchioni)

Mr. G. Sanchioni's submission expressed his concern over the impact of increasing aircraft noise on residents surrounding Pearson International Airport as the facility expands. The submission requested that the following be provided for general information:

* the guidelines used to make land use planning decisions in relation to the mitigation of community noise levels, from growth of the airport, prior to Regionalization and in the City of Brampton after Regionalization;

* the variance between the noise contours estimated by analytical model (in the draft Plan) and those used for community planning in 1988, 1987, 1986, 1985, 1980, 1975 and 1970;

* validation of the effectiveness of the analytical model used to generate the contours identified in the Plan by comparison with actual noise level measurements for the above noted time period;

* an estimation of the maximum capacity of the airport and the percent of that maximum represented by 1989 air traffic volume; and,

* a specific reference to the "research" noted in the footnote to Appendix Table A7.1.

Staff Comments

This submission requested that information be provided in answer to the five questions previously outlined. The response is as follows:

* Prior to Regionalization (in 1974), there were no specific planning guidelines regarding noise mitigation articulated in the plans for the former municipalities which now comprise the City of Brampton. In 1978 the Ministry of Housing adopted a land use policy based on the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) system. The policy states that all land use proposals near airports must adhere to an NEF Land Use Compatibility Table, which is included in Appendix 7 of the draft Plan. The policy also presented Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) contours, representing a longer range projection, which were considered (by the Ministry of Housing) to be more appropriate for land use planning purposes.

Since that time Regional and City of Brampton staff have used the NEP contours, which have been updated periodically, with the Land Use Compatibility Table, as presented in Appendix 7 of the draft Plan.

* There is no "variance" between the noise pattern contours developed by analytical model (assuming this refers to NEF and NEP contours published by Transport Canada) and the contours used for "community planning" as they have been one in the same thing since the release of the Land Use Policy Near Airports by the Ministry of Housing in 1978.

* Actual noise level measurements are currently being taken by the City of Brampton. Brampton Alderman E. Ludlow is Chairman of a tri-municipal airport committee which is looking at airport noise-related problems including flight path violations.

* Regional staff do not have this information. It is probably most appropriate to contact the Ministry of Transport or the airport directly.

* The footnotes to Table A7.1 (Appendix 7 of the draft Plan) are taken directly from the Provincial Land Use Policy Near Airports (1978). A specific reference to the research noted in "footnote 4" can be obtained from the document entitled, "Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports," (document S-77-4), Ministry of Transport (Canada).

G. REGIONAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.

Concerns (The Mississauga Board of Trade)

The Board submits that the Plan should articulate a supportive role with respect to economic development. This is an area municipal responsibility and Section 1.1a of the Plan should articulate this more clearly. The Board also submits that Section 2.1a should be expanded so as to better articulate its intent and application. The Board also requests that the Region seek its input in its efforts to clarify the scope of Section 2.1a.

Staff Comments

In response to the Board's concern regarding Section 1.1(a) "Economic Development" it must be stated that Section 1.1 "Scope of the Plan" has been written to explain the structure and content of the document. Review of the Objectives (Part 2) and policies in the remainder of the document reveals that the Region does not intend to direct how the area municipalities will conduct local business development initiatives. The Plan does propose a coordinating role by the Region concerning matters pertaining to economic

growth since they impact on the provision of the services for which Peel is directly responsible.

The intent and application of the "Regional Goals" (Section 2.1) are explained in Section 2.2, "Regional Objectives." Further articulation of how the Plan proposes to work toward the Regional goals can be found in Parts 3, 4 and 5 of the Plan.

H. AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Concerns (Mississauga Board of Trade)

The Board submitted concerns in relation to paragraph 2.2.6.13 and Appendix 5. In reference to paragraph 2.2.6.13, the Board questions how and by what mechanism Council plans to encourage the private sector to produce low-cost housing in cooperation with PNPHC. It is also concerned that the provision of low to moderate-cost housing by Peel Non-Profit could be "out of step" with the private sector. It recommends the development of an "advisory group" to allow liaison with the local development industry. In reference to Appendix 5, the Board feels that the issuance of lot levies with respect to the provision of social housing is counter-productive. It requests that the Region seek input from the Board in developing a social housing program.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 2.2.6.13 states that Regional Council, in cooperation with the area municipalities and other levels of government, intends to encourage the private sector to produce low and moderate-cost private and rental housing in Peel Region.

In response to the Board's concerns, it is important to note that Regional staff do not know all the mechanisms which will be used to encourage private sector participation in the production of low-cost housing. These will evolve as needs, market conditions and the tax, regulatory and program environments change.

The efficiency of the private sector has been and will be utilized even in Peel's non-profit program. This implies a continued priority on turnkey projects and the continued use of private consultants and other resources at all stages of development. The key role of the private sector within the non-profit housing helps avoid the non-profit sector getting "out-of-step."

Private and public cooperation in housing delivery will be further enhanced. A number of opportunities are being explored or considered for the future:

* leasing private land for non-profit housing;

* joint-venture and mixed-use projects with formal, legal partnerships;

* non-profit assumption of marketing and/or management of private projects targeted for "affordability";

* PNPHC assistance with planning and approvals for low-cost private housing; and

* exploration with individual developers and with representative organizations of possible means for municipal governments and private sector to comply with requirements of the Provincial Land Use Planning for Housing policy statement.

Again, the Region already has a well established network for the formulation of policies and programs in this regard. A single "advisory committee" may prove useful, but experience to date suggests more focused groups drawing on those parts of the industry with the most pertinent expertise, will be more effective.

The Region fully recognizes the need to concentrate assistance upon those most in need. Further, inter-departmental cooperation assures a more comprehensive approach to complex personal situations, which differ greatly amongst various types of households. Against the objective of efficiency of subsidy assistance, however, must be balanced the objective of achieving integrated communities and the avoidance of any perceived segregation or isolation of those in need.

In response to the Board's concern regarding the issuance of lot levies, it must be noted that lot levies have been the subject of protracted discussion with private sector representatives, and will undoubtedly continue to be so. The Region has steadfastly refused to alter its lot levy policies for the reasons outlined in the report of the Regional Treasurer titled, "Response to the Provincial 'Green Paper' - Financing Growth - Related Capital Needs", dated February 6, 1989.

I. REGIONAL ROAD NOISE

Concern (Mississauga Board of Trade)

The Mississauga Board of Trade submits that more flexibility has to be drafted into paragraph 3.5.5.1. The phrase "shall not be permitted" is too restrictive and may be difficult to implement.

Staff Comments

Paragraph 3.5.5.1 could be revised to read "Development along Regional Roads, which includes outdoor living areas, shall be required to incorporate noise abatement measures to reduce outdoor noise levels to an acceptable level. The objective noise level limits are specified in the Guidelines for Noise Control in Land Use Planning prepared by the Province . . ."

J. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Concerns (The Mississauga Board of Trade)

The Board submits that the first paragraph in Subsection 6.2.5. is inappropriate in that site plan control is a local municipal responsibility. The Board also questions whether financial matters such as those in Section 6.3 are appropriate in an official plan. Finally, the Board expresses an interest in participating with the Region in monitoring growth-related change in Peel.

Staff Comments

Section 40(8) of the Planning Act provides clear authority to the Region with respect to requirements within areas of site plan control. It is clearly a Regional responsibility, under Section 40(8), to ensure that consideration is given to various factors as they affect Regional Roads. Subsection 6.2.4 of the Plan merely articulates this responsibility.

In response to the Board's comment concerning the appropriateness of Subsection 6.3.2 "Regional Budget," the Planning Act requires that all municipal public works conform to the respective official plan. The implementation of works programs depends on the annual and five-year capital works budgets. The Plan is simply articulating this relationship as information for all interested parties.

K. DESIGNATION OF ANCESTRAL BURIAL SITES

Concerns (M. Harrison)

Mr. M. Harrison is concerned that Schedule A designates the burial site of his great great grandmother and her newborn baby as "Estate Residential Policy Area." The site is located in Lot 9, Concession 10 (former Toronto Gore Township) in the City of Brampton. Mr. Harrison is concerned that subsequent development of the subject lands may destroy the site.

Staff Comments

In the written response to Mr. Harrison's concerns, it was pointed out that the burial site appeared to be designated "Rural Lands" in the draft Plan and "Agricultural" in the City of Brampton's Plan. Confusion regarding the designation of the subject lands may have come as a result of the general delineation of the "Rural Estate Development Policy Area" land use designation on Schedule A of the draft Plan. The precise boundaries for these land use designations are to be determined from the respective area municipal plan. To clarify this, a statement should be added to Subsection 5.2.2. explaining that the designations in the Regional Plan are general and that the more detailed land use policies in the respective area municipal plan must be reviewed to determined their boundaries.

If an application to develop the land is received, the requirement for a "site disposition agreement" (under the Cemeteries Act) will likely be placed as a condition of approval. This will require that the proponent discuss the options available (under the Act) regarding the burial site, with the Act's Registrar and all interested parties identified by the Registrar.

SUMMARY

Regional Planning staff received submissions on forty-eight specific parts of the draft Plan. In most instances staff comments consisted of an explanation of the intent of the goal, objective or policy in question. In response to a number of submissions, though, staff have stated that the Plan could be revised.

Following is a summary of these comments. All of the comments outlined in this report are for discussion purposes only at this time. The following comments, therefore, are not recommendations for Council adoption. They will be used with the submissions received at the October 12th public meeting and with the comments received from the area municipalities, Provincial agencies and adjacent municipalities to make final recommendations regarding revisions to the draft Plan. These will be submitted to Council for adoption in early 1990. The recommendations can only be made after Planning staff have been able to assess the submissions from all interested parties.

The summary of staff comments indicating possible revisions to the draft Plan are as follows:

A) Waste Management

The Mississauga Landfill Site Liaison Committee submitted a very thought provoking and comprehensive review of Section 4.4. Many

of their comments have prompted staff to identify possible changes to the draft Plan. These are as follows:

* A number of policies which use the word "may", indicating Council discretion could be revised to read "shall". The policies in question are paragraphs 4.4.6.2, 4.4.6.9. and 4.4.6.10. of the Plan.

A statement could be added to Subsection 4.4.3. "Waste Management Master Plan" stating that the Master Plan must conform to the Regional Official Plan. It is not necessary to require the Master Plan to conform to the area municipal official plans because they are already required to conform to the Regional Official Plan.

* Paragraph 4.4.4.2. which currently reads "The establishment of a new Sanitary Landfill Site or the expansion of an existing site shall require an amendment to this Plan "could be revised to include the phrase "...and shall have regard for all relevant Provincial Legislation" to follow "...shall require an amendment to this Plan and the respective area municipal plan..."

* Paragraph 4.4.4.7, which reads "Sanitary Landfill Sites which have been completed shall be rehabilitated to uses which conform to this Plan and the Environmental Protection Act...", could be revised to read "...uses which conform to this Plan, the respective area municipal plan and the Environmental Protection Act..."

* Paragraph 4.4.4.8., which reads "Council shall ensure long-term safety by establishing gas and leachate monitoring programs when necessary prior to, during and following the operation of all Sanitary Landfill Sites", could be revised to read "...gas and leachate monitoring programs and treatment facilities if these facilities are considered to be necessary on the basis of monitoring programs prior to..."

* Paragraph 4.4.5.2., which reads "the establishment of new Waste Processing Plants... shall require an amendment to this Plan", could be revised to include the phrase "... and shall have regard for all relevant Provincial legislation." to follow "... shall require an amendment to this Plan and the respective area municipal plan...".

B) Transportation

Residents living along 20th Sideroad and along the 10th Line East in the Town of Caledon (in former Albion Township) submitted concerns regarding the designation of these roads (east of Highway 50) as "Major Arterials" on Schedule 2 of the draft Plan. These designations could be removed from Schedule 2. This staff position was reached

further to discussions with Mayor Kolb and Councillor Currie and has been supported by a recent Resolution of Caledon Council.

The Better By-pass for Bolton Group submitted their opposition to the designation of a "Major Arterial" road by-passing Bolton to the east. Regional staff recognize that this designation could be revised but only after the results of transportation studies, currently being completed by the Town in close cooperation with Regional staff, are complete.

C) Regional Road Noise

The Mississauga Board of Trade submitted that paragraph 3.5.5.1., which reads "Development along Regional Roads which includes outdoor living area shall not be permitted in locations where the outdoor levels are forecast to exceed the limits which are specified in the Guidelines for Noise Control in Land Use Planning..." should be made more flexible.

Revisions to paragraph 3.5.5.1 could be made so that the policy reads "Development along Regional roads...shall be required to incorporate noise abatement measures to reduce outdoor noise levels to an acceptable level. The objective noise level limits are specified..."

D) Designation of Ancestral Burial Sites

Mr. Harrison was concerned that an ancestral burial site had been designated "Estate Residential Development Policy Area" and that subsequent development may destroy the site. Staff commented, in a letter sent to Mr. Harrison, that the site appeared to be designated "Rural Lands" on Schedule A. Policies in the draft Plan made reference to the more detailed area municipal official plans but Subsection 5.2.2. could be revised to explain that the "Rural Estate Development Policy Area" designation is general and that the more detailed area municipal policies should be reviewed.

RECOMMENDATIONS Amended

That the report of the Commissioner of Planning titled "Response to Submissions Received During Public Circulation of the Draft Official Plan," dated September 6, 1989 be received and used as a reference in preparation for the October 12, 1989 public meeting;

And further, that copies of the report be sent to all parties who made submissions with notification that the public meeting is to be held on October 12, 1989 during the regularly scheduled meeting of Regional Council and to the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga and the Town of Caledon for their information;

And further, that notification of the submission of the subject report to Planning Committee and Council be sent to all parties currently listed on the Plan Circulation File.

And further, that said notification inform all interested parties that the Council approved public meeting will be held on October 12, 1989 during the regularly scheduled meeting of Regional Council.

And further that the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton and the Town of Caledon be asked to submit their comments on the draft Plan by no later than November 6, 1989.

Peter E. Allen

Peter E. Allen
Commissioner of Planning

PEA:DAW:es/nb

1-32

ITEM 1.

REGION OF PEEL

PUBLIC FORUM ON THE DRAFT
REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN
(Mississauga Civic Centre)

TUESDAY, May 30, 1989
7:30 p.m.

A G E N D A

Chairman: Councillor David Culham, Chairman, Regional Planning Committee

Opening Remarks

Presentations

a) Mr. Peter Allen, Commissioner of Planning regarding the public circulation process

b) The audio visual presentation summarizing the contents of the draft plan

Public Submissions

Concluding Remarks

Adjournment

NOTE: If you have any further questions or wish to make additional comments, please give us a call at 791-9400 (ext. 350) or write to us at:

The Regional Municipality of Peel
Planning Department
10 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton, Ontario
L6T 4B9

NOTE: The following resolution was approved by Regional Council on September 28, 1989 and therefore replaces those recommendations contained in the enclosed report of the Commissioner of Planning dated September 11, 1989.

"That the report of the Commissioner of Planning dated September 11, 1989, titled "Response to Submissions Received During Public Circulation of the Draft Official Plan" be received and used as a reference in preparation for the October 12, 1989 public meeting;

And further, that copies of the subject report be sent to all parties who made submissions with notification that the public meeting is to be held on October 12, 1989 during the regularly scheduled meeting of Regional Council and to the City of Brampton, the City of Mississauga and the Town of Caledon for their information;

And further, that notification of the submission of the subject report to Planning Committee and Regional Council be sent to all parties currently listed on the Plan Circulation File;

And further, that said notification inform all interested parties that the Regional Council approved public meeting will be held on October 12, 1989 during the regularly scheduled meeting of Regional Council;

And further, that the City of Mississauga, the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon be asked to submit their comments on the draft Plan by no later than November 6, 1989;

And further, that Planning staff meet with City of Brampton planning staff and representatives from the mineral resource industry and report back to Planning Committee on the issue of potential mineral resource area designations;

And further, that Planning staff report back to Planning Committee on the identification of environmentally significant areas prior to the approval of land use policy."